

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>APPLICATION NO: 22/01656/FUL</b>         |  | <b>OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren</b>             |
| <b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 14th September 2022 |  | <b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 9th November 2022 |
| <b>WARD:</b> Charlton Kings                 |  | <b>PARISH:</b> CHARLK                     |
| <b>APPLICANT:</b>                           | Mr And Mrs Lucking                             |   |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                            | 82 East End Road Charlton Kings Cheltenham     |   |
| <b>PROPOSAL:</b>                            | Part single and part two storey rear extension |   |

## REPRESENTATIONS

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Number of contributors    | <b>3</b> |
| Number of objections      | <b>2</b> |
| Number of representations | <b>0</b> |
| Number of supporting      | <b>1</b> |

1 Balcarras Retreat  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8QU

**Comments:** 2nd October 2022

It is essential we encourage the residents in the Charlton Kings direct area to invest in the community. Allowing a family to grow their home, facilitating a happier environment for their children to flourish does exactly this. We need to strengthen those families who already have roots and loyalties to the schools, church and various community initiatives to stay within Charlton Kings. This application, if successful, achieves exactly this.

84 East End Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8QL

**Comments:** 20th September 2022

Re Planning Ref - 22/01656/FUL  
Proposal: Part single and part two storey rear extension at 82 East End Rd Charlton Kings Cheltenham

We wish to strongly object to the proposed two storey and single storey side and rear extensions at No.82 East End Rd. Over the years the original property has already been extended significantly to both the side and the rear. These extensions were carried out to substantially increase the size of the property yet sympathetically maintain the natural light levels, privacy, visual impact and general ambience of neighbouring properties.

We find it hard to comprehend that further intrusive extensions to the property are being proposed, especially as no other property in the area has been extended in such a way as to have such a large impact on its neighbours. If the application is successful, we will lose substantial natural light to our kitchen / dining room / understairs cupboard and upstairs landing / bedroom. I would also like to highlight misleading and inaccurate information shown on the submitted plans (drawing number 1330.1) it states 2 'windows' but one of which is a door and not a window. It is not just the one kitchen window that will be seriously impacted by loss of natural light and overshadowing, but also our ground floor understairs cupboard and upstairs landing window and upstairs rear bedroom window. The single window highlighted on the plans is our main source of natural light for the kitchen and an important source of light for our dining room, it does not supply light to a single room as implied erroneously on the plans. It is essential that all the rooms affected receive adequate levels of natural light as they have for the last 50 years, and which is a basic human requirement.

With the proposed extension far exceeding the original building line of the existing properties and being right up against our boundary fence we will lose privacy in our back garden, it will be overlooked and greatly overshadowed by a two-storey brick wall, in effect giving rise to a tunnelling effect between the two properties. The visual impact will be overbearing and very oppressive. As well as a loss of privacy in the garden we object to the bathroom window which will be facing our property and against our boundary on the proposed side extension. This window will mean our upstairs landing window is overlooked and will result in light pollution at night.

In addition, we are very concerned with the design and note recent NPPF changes regarding high quality design and greater weight to be given during planning balance. Our concerns are its overwhelming transformative impact it does not read as secondary or subservient to the original property in any way.

If further space is required there are options available that are far less obtrusive to neighbouring properties, such as the loft extensions that several properties in the local area have recently had.

Having resided in my property for over 50 years it would be a great shame for a precedent to be set where back gardens can be built upon unnecessarily and to the detriment of those that want to enjoy their gardens and views as they have for many years. We sincerely hope this application is rejected for the reasons stated.

**Comments:** 1st November 2022

Letter attached.

84 East End Road  
Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8QL

**Comments:** 4th November 2022

Following the recent revised plans that have been submitted I would like to state that they have not addressed our initial concerns at all. Our main concern was the loss of light to our kitchen window and the fact that the 25 degree ruling is being totally ignored. The revised plans may mean the light impact to our kitchen door is reduced, but a doorway cannot be included when measuring light levels, only the window which is our main source of light. I am disappointed that the revised plans have not addressed this at all. The extension will still be overbearing and have an impact on our quality of life due to loss of light in the property we have lived in for over 50 years. Due to the impact the decision will have and before it is made, I would like to request that the applicant engages a specialist light level company to measure our current light levels and advise on the impact the extension will have.

Re Planning Ref – 22/01656/FUL

Proposal: Part single and part two storey rear extension at 82 East End Rd Charlton Kings  
Cheltenham

We wish to strongly object to the proposed two storey and single storey side and rear extensions at No.82 East End Rd. Over the years the original property has already been extended significantly to both the side and the rear. These extensions were carried out to substantially increase the size of the property yet sympathetically maintain the natural light levels, privacy, visual impact and general ambience of neighbouring properties.

We find it hard to comprehend that further intrusive extensions to the property are being proposed, especially as no other property in the area has been extended in such a way as to have such a large impact on its neighbouring properties. If the application is successful, we will lose substantial natural light to our kitchen / dining room / understairs cupboard and upstairs landing / bedroom. I would also like to highlight misleading and inaccurate information shown on the submitted plans (drawing number 1330.1) for the 2 'windows' (one of which is a French door) at no.84. It is not just the window and French doors that will be seriously impacted by loss of natural light and overshadowing, but also our ground floor understairs cupboard and upstairs landing window and upstairs rear bedroom window. The window and French door highlighted on the plans are our main source of natural light for the kitchen and an important source of light for our dining room, they do not supply light to a single room as implied erroneously on the plans. It is essential that all the rooms affected receive adequate levels of natural light as they have for the last 50 years, and which is a basic human right.

With the proposed extension far exceeding the original building line of the existing properties and being right up against our boundary fence we will lose privacy in our back garden, it will be overlooked and greatly overshadowed by a two-storey brick wall. The visual impact will be overbearing and very oppressive. As well as a loss of privacy in the garden we object to the bathroom window which will be facing our property and against our boundary on the proposed side extension. This window will mean our upstairs landing window is overlooked and will result in light pollution at night.

If further space is required there are options available that are far less obtrusive to neighbouring properties, such as the loft extensions that several properties in the local area have recently had.

Having resided in my property for over 50 years it would be a great shame for a precedent to be set where back gardens can be built upon unnecessarily and to the detriment of those that want to enjoy their gardens and views as they have for many years. We sincerely hope this application is rejected for the reasons stated.